

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,213	11/25/2003	Nyle Elliott	A-8730	4978
	7590 11/14/200 ASSON & GITLER, P.		EXAM	INER .
CRYSTAL CE	CRYSTAL CENTER 2, SUITE 522 2461 SOUTH CLARK STREET		MENDEZ, MANUEL A	
	VA 22202-3843		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		•	3763	
				<del></del>
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

~1	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/720,213	ELLIOTT ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manuel Mendez	3763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addre	ess
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this community BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 J	ulv 2007		
	s action is non-final.		
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowa		tters, prosecution as to the m	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under the		·	
isposition of Claims		,	
_	dication		
4)  Claim(s) <u>1-4, 7 and 8</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	WIT HOTH CONSIDERATION.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4, 7, and 8</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
pplication Papers	·		
· _			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		hu tha Eugainea	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			1 121(d)
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • •	• •
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	priority under 35 U.S.C.	\$ 110(a) (d) ar (f)	
<ul><li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li><li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li></ul>	priority under 35 U.S.C.	9 119(a)-(u) 01 (1).	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			age
application from the International Bureau	•		- J-
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		t received.	
	·		
tachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

## **DETAILED ACTION**

In view of the Notice from Withdrawal from Issue Branch and the lack of patentability of the pending claims, the finality established on the Final Office Action dated April 6, 2006 is hereby withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Thornton, Meythaler et al., Stone, and in further view of Binard, et al. The Kelly patent does not disclose the use of filters at the distal and proximal ends. However, the Thornton patent demonstrates that it is conventional to design catheters having hydrophobic tips; furthermore, in relation to the use of filters in combination with infusion ports, Meythaler et al., demonstrates that such use is conventional in the art. Additionally, Stone demonstrates that the use of hydrophobic and charcoal filters in combination with filters is well known in the art. Finally, concerning the amended language in claims 1 and 7, in figure 7, Binard, et al., demonstrates the conventionality of severing the proximal section of a catheter shaft when the inflation lumen becomes obstructed.

Based on the above observations, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, the modification of the Kelly catheter with hydrophobic or charcoal filters positioned at the

Art Unit: 3763

proximal or distal ends of said catheter and the step of severing the proximal end to deflate the balloon would have been considered obvious in view of the conventionality of these enhancements.

Finally, in response to the arguments in the Appeal Brief concerning the one-way port, and more specifically, the argument stating that "Kelly does not disclose the one-way port disclosed and claimed in the application and Binard does not cure this deficiency", the examiner notes for the record that Meythaler et al. discloses in column 3, lines 17-20, that "[t]he catheter assembly can also include a one-way valve for the introduction of drugs, fluids or medications through the catheter assembly with no back-flow of the introduced materials. With this design, the catheter assembly limits the introduction of pathogens into the system and reduces the potential contact of the health care provider to bodily fluids". Accordingly, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying the apparatus disclosed by Kelly with a one-way valve, as taught by Meythaler et al., would have been considered obvious in view of the conventionality of this enhancement. Moreover, such enhancement would have served to improve the safety of use and the infusion capabilities of the catheter.

## Conclusion

In view of the withdrawal of finality, this action is not a final office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manuel Mendez whose telephone number is 571-272-4962. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800 hrs.

Art Unit: 3763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Nicholas D. Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 577-272-1000.

Manuel Mendez Primary Examiner Art Unit 3763

MM